UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,172	06/14/2001	John Mark Hartel	AUS920010225US1	7996

35525 7590 08/17/2004

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
ARSHAD, UMAR	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/882,172	HARTEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Umar Arshad	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 April 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-37 and 39-41* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 4/29/2004.

Claims 1 – 41 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 are independent claims. In the amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 33, 37, and 39 - 41 were amended and claim 38 was cancelled. This action is made Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9, 12 – 15, 19 – 21, 24 – 27, 31 – 33 and 36 – 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,417,872 in view of Carter, U.S. Patent No. 6,208,336.

As per claim 1, Zimmerman et al. ("Zimmerman") teaches a method, in a data processing system, for editing a property, comprising: identifying one or more property

editors associated with the property; selecting a graphical user interface based on the one or more property editors; and providing the graphical user interface for use in editing the property (see Zimmerman, column 2, lines 25 - 40).

Zimmerman does not teach identifying one or more methods invoked by a property editor associated with the property; selecting a graphical user interface based on the one or more methods invoked by the property editor; and providing the graphical user interface for use in editing the property. Carter teaches identifying one or more methods invoked by an application; selecting a graphical user interface based on the one or more methods invoked by the application; and providing the graphical user interface for use (see Carter, column 2, lines 6 – 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Carter with the method of Zimmerman in order to provide a single application having only a desired functionality to users without requiring creation of several versions of the application.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman does not teach the method of claim 1, wherein the one or more methods invoked by the property editor identify one or more abilities of the property editor. Carter teaches wherein the one or more methods invoked by an application identify one or more abilities of the application (see Carter, column 4, lines 30 – 44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to incorporate the method of Carter with the method of Zimmerman in order to provide specific functionality in a single application to users without requiring creation of several versions of the application.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the one or more methods invoked by the editor include one or more PropertyEditor Interface methods (see Zimmerman, column 9, lines 7 – 9; the examiner interprets calling the MapPropertyToPage method as a PropertyEditor Interface method).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 2, wherein if the one or more abilities include an ability to edit a property using tags, the graphical user interface include: at least one of a popup choice selection area virtual button and a current selection display field (see Zimmerman, column 6, lines 26 – 32).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 7 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 7, wherein if the popup choice selection area virtual button is selected, a choice selection area popup is presented (see Zimmerman, column 6, lines 26 – 32).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 2, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). The method of claim 2, wherein if the one or more abilities includes an ability to edit the property using a custom editor interface, the graphical user interface includes a popup custom component area virtual button (see Zimmerman, column 6, line 53 – 64; the examiner interprets the tabs representing property groups to be popup custom component area virtual button because by selecting a tab, a custom property sheet page is displayed).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 9, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 9 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 9, wherein a custom component area is presented in response to selection of the popup custom component area virtual button, and wherein the custom component area includes a custom editor for the property (see Zimmerman, column 6, lines 53 – 64; the examiner interprets a property sheet page as a custom component area including a custom editor for the property because it contains various properties of a specific type of object).

As per claims 13 – 15, 19 – 21 and 24, they are of similar scope to claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9 and 12, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale (see rejections above).

As per claims 25 – 27, 31 – 33 and 36, they are of similar scope to claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9 and 12, respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale (see rejections above).

As per claim 37, it is of similar scope to claim 3 and is rejected under the same rationale (see rejection above).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 37, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 37 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 37, wherein if the one or more methods include a getTags, method, the graphical user interface includes a popup choice selection area virtual button and a current selection display field (see Zimmerman, column 8, lines 55 – 60; the examiner interprets the GetPredefinedStrings method to be a getTags method).

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 37, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 37 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 37, wherein if the one or more methods includes at lease one of a supportsCustomEditor method and a getCustomEditor method, the graphical user interface includes a popup custom component area virtual button (see Zimmerman, column 9, lines 1 – 17; the examiner interprets the MapPropertyToPage method as a getCustomEditor method).

Claims 4 – 6, 10, 11, 16 – 18, 22, 23, 28 – 30, 34, 35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman, U.S. Patent No. 6,417,872 in view of Carter, U.S. Patent No. 6,208,336, further in view of Lindhorst et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,337,696.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). Zimmerman and Carter do not teach the method of claim 2, wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area. Lindhorst teaches the method wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 27 – 31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman and Carter in order to allow the user to edit properties that must be input as strings.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Zimmerman, Carter and Lindhorst teach the method of claim 4 (see rejection above). Zimmerman and Carter do not teach the method of claim 4, wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the graphical user interface further includes an entry error indicator. Lindhorst teaches the method wherein if the one or more abilities include a text editing ability, the

graphical user interface further includes an entry error indicator (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 54 – 57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman and Carter in order to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Zimmerman, Carter and Lindhorst teaches the method of claim 5 (see rejection above). Zimmerman and Carter do not teach the method of claim 5, wherein the entry error indicator is only visible when an entry in the text field entry area is invalid. Lindhorst teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the entry error indicator is only visible when an entry in the text field entry area is invalid (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 51 – 53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman and Carter in order to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 9 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 9, wherein if the one or more abilities includes an ability to edit the property using a custom editor interface. Zimmerman and Carter do not teach wherein the graphical user interface further includes at least one of a text entry field and an entry error indicator. Lindhorst teaches wherein the graphical user interface further includes at

least one of a text entry field and an entry error indicator (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 27 – 31 and Lindhorst, column 18, lines 54 – 57).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman and Carter in order to allow the user to edit properties that must be input as strings and to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Zimmerman, Carter and Lindhorst teach the method of claim 10 (see rejection above). Zimmerman and Carter do not teach the method of claim 10, wherein the entry error indicator is only displayed when an invalid entry is entered in the text field entry area. Lindhorst teaches wherein the entry error indicator is only displayed when an invalid entry is entered in the text field entry area (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 51 – 53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman and Carter in order to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

As per claims 16 and 28, they are of similar scope to claim 4 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 17 and 29, they are of similar scope to claim 5 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 18 and 30, they are of similar scope to claim 6 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 22 and 34, they are of similar scope to claim 10 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claims 23 and 35, they are of similar scope to claim 11 and are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 (see rejection above).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37, Zimmerman and Carter teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Zimmerman further teaches the method of claim 37, wherein one or more methods includes at least one of a getAsText method and a setAsText method (see Zimmerman, column 8, lines 18 – 20; the examiner interprets the GetDisplayString method as a getAsText method).

Zimmerman and Carter do not teach wherein if the one or more methods includes at least one of a getAsText method and a setAsText method, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area and an entry error indicator. Lindhorst teaches wherein if one or more methods includes receiving a string input, the graphical user interface includes a text field entry area and an entry error indicator (see Lindhorst, column 18, lines 27 – 31 and lines 48 – 57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to incorporate the method of Lindhorst with the method of Zimmerman and Carter in order to allow the user to edit properties that must be input as strings and to ensure that only valid input is received by the property editor.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

UA